

THE CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

Volume II.

LOUISVILLE, KY., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1866.

Number 6

Drs. Breckinridge and Hodge as antagonists thirty-three years ago.

We have published in our columns very extensive extracts from Dr. Hodge against the "Act and Testimony" in 1834. A friend has put into our hands an old pamphlet of Dr. Breckinridge—entitled "A Plain Statement in relation to some matters involved in the second attack of Charles Hodge, D.D., published in the Biblical Repository for Jan., 1835, upon the ACT AND TESTIMONY."

As well for the purpose of letting our readers hear both sides, and to illustrate how history repeats itself, and as explanatory of Dr. Hodge's recent attack upon the Declaration and Testimony—we make room for like extensive extracts from this pamphlet:

"Whatever any one may consider himself at liberty to say or insinuate to the contrary, all the original signers of the Act and Testimony, and many others, who then said they were their friends, know that *constant* was laid upon me to take what was said in the preparation of that paper. And this is perfectly well known to Dr. Hodge. I had always considered him an Old School man; I had also allowed myself to suppose that he was my friend, and therefore called him in company with a mutual friend, at his lodgings in Philadelphia, where he then happened to be, on the very day that the draft of the Act and Testimony was written, and laid before him. We met at his lodgings, a third person; and a general explanation was made of the whole case, embracing a detail as to the origin of the statements of error, &c., and a free conversation followed among the four persons present, (three of whom have never signed the Act and Testimony, and who then did, and still do occupy high official stations, two of them at Princeton, and the third in our church) as to the extent to which the proposed testimony should go; after which it was, that I agreed to confine the testimony to the *Platonic* heresy, as being the worst, and most dangerous, and as being the one most likely to unite all sound men against."

As already known to the public, the recommendation for the call of a convention was afterwards added; the paper issued, and the public attention, of all the ministers, elders, and church courts. As already stated, in my public defence, Dr. Hodge objected to the recommendation in the original paper, and in the *Testimony*, and considered it *unlawful* for Presbyteries and Synods, as *de facto*, out of our church. In this point also his wishes were consulted; and the gentlemen whom I met as a committee, Dr. Greig, Dr. Maguire, and others, it is said afterwards at the Rev. Mr. Engles' church, will testify, I have no doubt, that I told them what is stated above. *I also told, as I then told these last named gentlemen, and as I presume, Dr. Hodge will admit, that he had written the end of the manuscript put into his hands by me, and drawn in part from Dr. Hodge's letter then recently published, the very words and letters found in the original paper, as the Act and Testimony.*

They will further testify, I cannot doubt, that the recommendation objected to by Dr. Hodge was afterwards modified and softened as to meet precisely what was understood to be his difficulty. The original paper will show, that a general admission, a common assent, a signing, by all sound men was emphatically recommended; which according to Dr. Hodge's present views, converts our testimony into a *test*, and authorizes him and all others, as he believes, to resent rather than submit to it, and induces him to insinuate so many harsh things, about our want of modesty, &c., &c. I can only say, that at the time the paper was formally corrected by him, he made no objection whatever to this feature of it; although the very object of my visit was to ask his advice, and his consent, and to put every thing in a form to meet his perfect approbation. And I most solemnly aver, that so far from his making any general objections such as he has since forthrightly reiterated, I left him, confidently believing, that he had actually signed the Act and Testimony. Indeed, Dr. H. has, I venture to say, in his hands written evidences, that some months after the time spoken of here, I felt myself authorized to state, in a public paper, that *even the able influence of Princeton should be allowed to operate against us*: to which the printed attack in the Repository, was the first reply; I aver, moreover, that I still consider myself as having had good grounds for this hope. For the testimony being filed to Dr. Hodge's mind, the recommendation being altered as he was understood to desire it, no objection being made by him to the kind of application to the general plan and spirit of the recommendation of the article being dropped; considering the previous course of the Repository and the Professors in the Seminary at Princeton; remembering the leading date of the crisis, and if it never existed before, our conduct was about to produce, bearing in mind who they were that were about to do this thing; and in view of the somewhat particular relations which existed between Dr. H. and myself, I am bound to say, that I still consider myself as having been fully authorized to expect that he would favor, if not actually sign the Act and Testimony. In view of Dr. Hodge's more recent conduct, I will not say, that I really believed in this; but I then supposed he did. I will not say, that he intended to make such impressions on my mind, as he did make. But I will say, that four situations had been reversed, and I had acted, as he did, I should certainly have intended to create in his mind the very impressions which his conduct created in mine.

He and the public will then judge of my astonishment at seeing in the October number of the Repository, a vehement attack on the Act and Testimony; and my dismay, when I saw it proclaimed on the homestead, by my enemies, suddenly fallen in love with Dr. H., that he was himself the author of the attack! Nor was my wonder lessened, to find personal allusions to myself mixed up in this article, and such as were denied, and others, (such as that of a *single* signing) of its composition) put forth as arguments against the Act and Testimony. About this time, I found myself rudely, repeatedly and publicly, on the floor of the Synod of Philadelphia, sneered at, and even threatened, as the author of the paper so triumphantly beaten down; by the friend of the author, and the instrument disparaged on that account, in more Presbyteries than one, and by more than one special friend of the gentlemen at Princeton, and especially in the Second (Synodical) Presbytery of Philadelphia. It is therefore in forgetfulness of his own past conduct, and in ignorance of the

conduct of his friends; or else, it is in want of proper fairness, that Dr. H. allows himself to use taunting and belittling expressions, to show that my defence of the Act and Testimony was gratuitous, and not personally called for. This is the more remarkable, when it was expressly required by himself, as a condition to printing a defence in the Biblical Repository, that I should do it under such a form of expression as would be to a certain extent, a personal designation!

Every reason led me to wish to avoid an controversy of any kind with Princeton, and every one of its Professors. I therefore expressly stated to Dr. H. that my article was not, in any sense, to be taken as a reply, or a review, or a comment, to or upon his. And notwithstanding what he says in his second number, to excuse his renewed pursuit of me, he was in full possession of my views on this subject. And any candid man, who will compare his first attack, and Mr. Engles' review of it, and my defence—all together, will see that I actually acted out of my purposes and declarations. It would therefore be no ways difficult to imagine these second and causeless draggings of me before the public, as very like the exhibition of a man who has been pushed down. If this be one of the present objects of the Repository—the sooner it effects it, and returns to its usual and more suitable work, the better for the cause it was once devoted to. That there are those who rejoice to view it in this light—the public know right well. That there are others who weep over the manifestations of such a spirit, the conductors of the Repository are not yet to learn. It is at least curious, that one whole article should be written directly at me; and three others, at their *"respected brethren,"* who signed the Act and Testimony—while Dr. Taylor's part, and Dr. Cox's part, and all such new allies' part, is—where? Echo answers—where? Alas! Our hearts may long pine for the day, when the Repository shall be filled with those noble discussions, on "Imputation," and "The Early History of Pelagianism," and their kindred articles, in which Dr. Hodge and his colleagues, enlightened our minds and tried our hearts, and fitting us for the work, which they now so heroically retreat from themselves, and so manfully berate us, for trying to accomplish!

If indeed, after all, it is so perfectly immaterial to Dr. H., who signed the Act and Testimony; and so entirely indifferent to men of sense, as he says it must be; why has he insisted on the plural *authors*, (as he insists on the plural *signers*), it is said afterwards at the Rev. Mr. Engles' church, will testify, I have no doubt, that I told them what is stated above. *I also told, as I then told these last named gentlemen, and as I presume, Dr. Hodge will admit, that he had written the end of the manuscript put into his hands by me, and drawn in part from Dr. Hodge's letter then recently published, the very words and letters found in the original paper, as the Act and Testimony.*

They will further testify, I cannot doubt, that the recommendation objected to by Dr. Hodge was afterwards modified and softened as to meet precisely what was understood to be his difficulty. The original paper will show, that a general admission, a common assent, a signing, by all sound men was emphatically recommended; which according to Dr. Hodge's present views, converts our testimony into a *test*, and authorizes him and all others, as he believes, to resent rather than submit to it, and induces him to insinuate so many harsh things, about our want of modesty, &c., &c. I can only say, that at the time the paper was formally corrected by him, he made no objection whatever to this feature of it; although the very object of my visit was to ask his advice, and his consent, and to put every thing in a form to meet his perfect approbation. And I most solemnly aver, that so far from his making any general objections such as he has since forthrightly reiterated, I left him, confidently believing, that he had actually signed the Act and Testimony. Indeed, Dr. H. has, I venture to say, in his hands written evidences, that some months after the time spoken of here, I felt myself authorized to state, in a public paper, that *even the able influence of Princeton should be allowed to operate against us*: to which the printed attack in the Repository, was the first reply; I aver, moreover, that I still consider myself as having had good grounds for this hope. For the testimony being filed to Dr. Hodge's mind, the recommendation being altered as he was understood to desire it, no objection being made by him to the kind of application to the general plan and spirit of the recommendation of the article being dropped; considering the previous course of the Repository and the Professors in the Seminary at Princeton; remembering the leading date of the crisis, and if it never existed before, our conduct was about to produce, bearing in mind who they were that were about to do this thing; and in view of the somewhat particular relations which existed between Dr. H. and myself, I am bound to say, that I still consider myself as having been fully authorized to expect that he would favor, if not actually sign the Act and Testimony. In view of Dr. Hodge's more recent conduct, I will not say, that I really believed in this; but I then supposed he did. I will not say, that he intended to make such impressions on my mind, as he did make. But I will say, that four situations had been reversed, and I had acted, as he did, I should certainly have intended to create in his mind the very impressions which his conduct created in mine.

He and the public will then judge of my astonishment at seeing in the October number of the Repository, a vehement attack on the Act and Testimony; and my dismay, when I saw it proclaimed on the homestead, by my enemies, suddenly fallen in love with Dr. H., that he was himself the author of the attack! Nor was my wonder lessened, to find personal allusions to myself mixed up in this article, and such as were denied, and others, (such as that of a *single* signing) of its composition) put forth as arguments against the Act and Testimony. About this time, I found myself rudely, repeatedly and publicly, on the floor of the Synod of Philadelphia, sneered at, and even threatened, as the author of the paper so triumphantly beaten down; by the friend of the author, and the instrument disparaged on that account, in more Presbyteries than one, and by more than one special friend of the gentlemen at Princeton, and especially in the Second (Synodical) Presbytery of Philadelphia. It is therefore in forgetfulness of his own past conduct, and in ignorance of the

gentleman ceases to urge so seriously and so frequently the argument drawn from the strength of his friends, and the weakness of ours, we shall at last be compelled to consider this so important a point in his estimate of duty, as to give up all expectation of ever being on the same side with him, until we are sure the greater number are there.

We will present our readers next week with the concluding observations of the pamphlet entire.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth
The Morality of Action.

What commission have men that authorize them to dally with convictions of truth? The delays of wisdom, and the providence of prudence, have no office within her sphere. When she speaks, we hear the voice of God; and we know that His commandment excludes expediency, as the sacrifice of fools. When, therefore, we ascertain the truth, we are under solemn obligation to entertain it. The chain is of adamant, which binds the proclamation, the reception, and the practice of truth in the logic of God. It cannot, without guilt, remain a barren entity—unfruitful as the rods of the rejected tribes. The mightiest instrumental power in the universe, having force in the hand of God to eject error and sin, and to sanctify the soul, was not intended to be a term without significance, an authority without power. The truth enlightens. The truth directs. The truth coerces. Our responsibility to God requires us to know the truth. Our imperative duty to act in her light, in the way she directs. Our knowledge must lead to action.

James upbraids with a sarcasm approved of God, those who say and do not. Christ likens those who know the commandments, and fail to obey them, to the house built upon the insufficient foundation. He warns those who know the Master's will and fail to do it, of the many stripes. The voice of inspiration, and the voice of reason, concur in urging men to let their principles lead to their proper consequences. We are under moral obligations to act as well as to know; to do as well as to confess. He is as recreant to the truth, who consciously lets pass this proper season of just action in the cause of right, and who fails to be her witness, as he who denies her an entrance into his mind. Infringement, infraction or fear often do the work of treason and infidelity. Israel knew his God, yet in practice frequently denied him. When this defection occurred, the sternest threatenings, and at times, the most direful punishment came from Heaven. God requires not merely a knowledge of his revealed will, but the discharge of duty consequent upon it. The criterion of the great last day is, not doctrine alone, but action based upon, and presupposing truth.

In every age of the church, not only is some doctrine prominently brought forward to challenge thorough controversy, the crucible of truth, the opposing error, and obtain a definite statement in terms, that it may be crystallized for all time; but corresponding with the conflict of divine doctrine, and the movement of formal theology, men are required in God's providence to under, at times, ecclesiastical ties—ties which bind them not to the church—but to a particular external organization of it. Often the exigencies of the case demand that they call into being, not indeed, another church, but another external organization. In 1837, it became necessary to divide the Presbyterian Church in the United States, into two separate organic bodies—each a Church. In 1843, the Church of Scotland was disrupted, and the Free and Established Churches became distinct bodies. In 1861, the General Assembly at Philadelphia caused and occasioned the division of the Old School Presbyterians into two separate Churches. The Assembly of 1866, which convened after the close of the war, by the re-affirmation of error in ecclesiology; and by the new doctrine, in the new interpretation of the constitution, in the case of the Louisville Presbytery, and Declaration and Testimony, has inaugurated the necessity for another separation.

In every case of this character the question is put to each man—What is duty? We are no more at liberty to act according to the dictates of caprice, or comfort or a selfish or inert desire for peace, or personal friendships, or ancient church connections, or avarice, in regard to our action, than in regard to our belief. On such occasions we must take a position. We do act a part, consciously or unwittingly; for to stand still then is to act against the party that moves. You must go with the Old or New School. You must go with the Established or Free Church. You must be with the church, north or south. You must be with the Assembly of 1866, or against it. If against it, what course do you intend to pursue? Do you mean to support an ecclesiastical

organization, known popularly as the Presbyterian Church, North, which differs from you in doctrine, on the great question of the day, when you can organize, or, at least, attend churches, and connect yourself with an organization, which holds opinions you approve? Will an Old School man support a New School Church? Or a Free Church man, an Established Church? By supporting and attending churches that do not hold your tenets, you do all in your power to sustain the error in the church you attend; and you sacrifice to unworthy motives, conscientious convictions respecting the differences between truth and falsehood. You are bound to worship God, according to that system, and in that way, which is more nearly conformed to His word. This is not a matter of choice, but duty. The same reason that would induce you to pass by a Methodist Church, or a New School Church, and enter an Old School Church, should impel you to pass an Assembly's Church, and worship in a True Presbyterian Church. Thus you will testify to the truth, and hold fast the form of sound words.

A Damaging Critique upon the Gurley Paper.

No. IV. of the "Minority Man's" essays on the last Assembly, leaves little room for speculation as to the authorship of these papers. There is but one man left in the church who combines the courage, the ability and the accomplishments needful to produce them. It should be a matter of gratitude to God, that when Princeton has so lamentably succumbed to the pressure, the one who has enjoyed the confidence of the church fully as largely as Princeton, should have the grace given him to stand forth for Christian freedom, Christian common sense, and Christian truth, even under the great disadvantage of being deserted in the crisis by Princeton. Says the writer:

Among the "Reasons" assigned by Dr. Gurley for the adoption of his memorable "ipse facto" decree, and which the Assembly formally accepted and incorporated with the edict itself, is one which many who entertain the highest respect for its excellent author, are compelled to regard as bordering upon the ludicrous. It is as follows:—"Because it saves us from even the appearance of taking action in this case, which is too summary and hasty." Though we might lawfully dissolve the Presbytery of Louisville at this time, no such great or perilous exigency has arrived as makes such an extraordinary proceeding necessary—or is it expedient. It is better for the Assembly, better for the Church, and better for all the interests in any way concerned in this case, that justice should be secured and administered in the ordinary way, and by the ordinary methods." These italics, from the original (vide Minutes General Assembly, p. 61.) give the grave reflection a peculiar gusto in view of the fact that what is here so complacently set forth as a measure of signal clemency, in full accord with the "ordinary methods" of our church, is without a solitary precedent from the organization of the General Assembly in 1789 to the present day. As regards the *ipse facto* style of capital punishment, no one will pretend that it was ever heard of before in our church, or in any other church, or in any respectable civil legislature—of this in the abstract, and in its fatal working, hereafter. For the present, let it suffice that this is the first Assembly to set up the dangerous prerogative of citing individuals to its bar (or to the bar of its successor) for trial. That this is the object is distinctly avowed. The Assembly, according to "Reason No. 3," is to "consider and adjudicate the case" and, in the report of the committee, the "citation" of these men is (justly) represented as the first step of a judicial process. This is going far beyond the Assembly of '37. Not to lay the least stress upon the fact, that the "citation" scheme which was initiated on a Friday was abandoned the following Tuesday, and so came to nothing, that Assembly proposed to cite only "judicatories." (Book of Discip. chap. vii. sec. 6.)

Neither on this occasion, nor on any other, did they claim the authority to cite individuals before them for trial. I have carefully examined the records of the church within my reach without finding an instance of this kind since 1789, the only case remotely approximating to it being one in which an heretical creed was, after protracted litigation with its author, referred by Synod to the Assembly, and the Assembly required the author to recant his sentiments. No such case was adduced at St. Louis. None has ever been presented in the pages of the Repository. If Dr. Baird had discovered one, he would have given it to us in his Digest. The instances are innumerable where the Assembly has either censured Synods and Presbyteries for neglecting discipline, or directed them to consider of it, or ordered them to do this and that. But never until now has this power of arraignment been, in any commencing process against them, been usurped by a General Assembly. So far from it, the Assembly has, on repeated occasions, (see Digest *passim*) re-affirmed the broad principle that no man can lawfully be tried in the Presbyterian Church except by his session or Presbytery.

It may suffice to refer to one example out of many. In the case of the Rev. Wm. C. Davis, the Assembly of 1810 (and its action was ratified by the Assembly of 1811) decided that the Synod of the Carolinas, while displaying a laudable zeal for the purity of the church, violated the Constitution in claiming a right to try Mr. Davis, "when there was no reference nor appeal in his case before them." So utterly baseless is the assumption, that this procedure at St. Louis was in keeping with the "ordinary methods" of administering justice in our church.

It well behooves our ministers and people to consider whether they are prepared to sanction these encroachments upon the Constitution. Every page of our Book of Discipline reveals the jealous care of its framers for the personal rights of all embraced in our communion. No man can be tried except by his peers. He must be tried at home—not a thousand miles away. He must have full notice as to charges, prosecutors, time and place, witnesses. He has the right of appeal to Presbytery, Synod, General Assembly. He is not to be finally condemned until three (or if a layman, four) different courts have passed upon his case, before every one of which he is entitled to a candid and patient hearing. Such are the safeguards the Constitution has thrown around the humblest individuals in the church. Does any man amongst us feel that these ramparts are too many, or too strong? What, then, must be thought of an Assembly which sought to annul all these indispensable provisions respecting the forms and modes of trial, which set aside Presbyteries and Synods as having no rights in the trial of their members; which denied the right of appeal by making an appeal impossible, and superseded the three tribunals of our Constitution, clothed with specific and separate powers, by a single autocratic court invested with absolute power over any minister it might choose to cite to its bar?

Even this is not the whole truth, nor anything approximating to the whole truth. These Declaration and Testimony men are not simply refused a trial, according to the forms of the Constitution. They are not simply required to plead at the bar of a court, to which the Constitution has denied all original jurisdiction in judicial cases, and which in seventy-seven years never arrogated this power before. The Assembly, as if apprehending that its successor might falter in carrying out the rough discipline intended for the offenders, pre-judges their case, and sends them to the following Assembly with its official brand upon their foreheads. It stigmatizes them as men so steeped in rebellion, that the Presbytery which tolerated the presence of any one of them dies as by a sudden visitation of God. It refers the case for trial to the next Assembly, after putting upon the indictment the ominous endorsement that one of the parties implicated "ought, as there is the strongest reason for believing, to have been suspended from the functions of the gospel ministry." (Minutes, p. 12.) In other words, they pronounce a man "guilty," and then hand him over for trial! What would the lawyers, who voted with the majority at St. Louis, think, not of a Grand Jury, but of a criminal court, which, in remitting a cause to its next term, or to another court of co-ordinate jurisdiction, should write upon the indictment, "We are of the opinion that this man ought to be hung." Yet to this style of jurisprudence have we come in the Presbyterian Church.

The Presbyter's last disquisition on Drs. Humphrey and Smith. The sort of people the New Synod is likely to bring to its Churches. The Presbyter of October 31st, has the following very plain talk about Kentucky men and affairs, which we lay before our readers just as we find it. To the people in our churches who have been seduced off from the Synod by the cry of "peace! peace!" we commend this article, with the inquiry—In which Synod are they likely to find most peace—standing off from—or adhering to the Assembly?

THE DEAD LETTER THEORY. We have a class of men in our church, whose hearts are on the fence between us and the South, but who cling to us, while the fence is being taken away from under them, for no very good reason, so far as we can discover. They join with the Declaration and Testimony party, in declaring upon the Assembly that its action is unconstitutional, unscriptural and unjust, and they claim that our action should be repealed, or treated as a dead letter. They promise all other dead letter theorists, that these acts never can or will be carried out. They declare that we do not intend to carry them out, thus charging us with deceit, as well as iniquity. With this class of men there is no hope of harmony and co-operation, unless they change. The son that accuses his mother of injustice and deception, but claims to kiss her and cling to her, must modify his heart and life before his adherence to her can do much for her comfort or her honor.

Our Kentucky Union men, like the adherents to our church in that State, claim that they are the only men who can do the work of reconstruction and pacification in the border States and in the South. Armed neutrality is their sovereign specific for the ills of the State; and for the Church, Balak's last recipe, "neither bless them at all, nor curse them at all," which we suppose, means that Balak's previous parables should be "a dead letter." The Assembly, in this case, has not lied and will not repent. The Church has said, and

will she not do it? has spoken, and will she not bring it to pass?

The middle party in the Border States claim that their position is peculiar, and that they only can judge what is best to save the church in their bounds, and to reclaim ministers and churches who have gone into the Southern Church. We would not put a straw in the way of their success. But as they profess to be at work for our church, we respectfully urge that they walk in the light of the spirit and action of the church. When they canvass between the Southern people and our church, let them not seem to make stump speeches, urging the people to choose the least of two evils, but let them defend the position of our Assembly, a lawful and expedient.

We had expected, now that the line of division is run between the parties in Kentucky, that those who adhere to us will experience and exhibit an increase of spiritual vigor. We shall be glad to see it when it comes to pass; but we do not look for it this year. The division is not complete. Forty-one ministers were absent from Synod, and many churches were not represented. We fear that it is too soon to expect a change of tactics before the next Assembly, or even then. There is to be a contest before the churches by "evangelists" (?) by whom the merits of the two Synods are to be discussed, and the people are to be aided in finding out their elective affinities. Until there shall be a segregation in every congregation, we expect the "dead letter" plank to remain in the platform of the Kentucky middle men, and in all probability, much longer.—After having filled the Western Presbytery with such speeches as those of Drs. Humphrey and Smith, and having widely circulated it among the churches in Kentucky, the advocates of the "dead letter" error will feel bound to go to the next Assembly, and resist all contradiction of it. Until the middle men in Kentucky can get on to the same platform with R. J. Breckinridge, Stanton, Cooper, McMillan, Morrison, Bradlock, and others, men whom they have helped to make uncomfortable among them, they need not ask for a Benjamin's portion of missionary funds to propagate the "dead letter" evangel; they must not ask the friends of the position of our church to give them special aid for a Kentucky paper, to do a work for the freedmen, and in reclaiming those who have wandered Southward, which only Kentucky middle men in their own judgment, are qualified to do; and they need not ask special patronage for their College in its extremity; for in so yielding to these claims, we cannot forget that we will be aiding them to sow tares among the wheat in our own field as well as in theirs.

The dead letter party are not confined to the border States. The North-Western Presbyterian earnestly advocates it, and it speaks to thousands in our church. Those who know the power of the press cannot fail to see that, under such tuition, this doctrine will spread and do mischief. In the Synod of Northern Indiana, when a resolution in opposition to this theory was before the body, several brethren of the Presbytery of Lake, opposed it. Brother Logan said: "Why shall this question be brought into our Synod? It is a controversy between Dr. Monfort, of the Presbyter, and Dr. Smith, of Baltimore, both good brethren.—Why shall we take part in their disputes?" We replied, that opposing the proposed resolution is taking part most emphatically. It is a controversy between Dr. Smith and others on one part, and the General Assembly on the other. We are only one of a thousand advocating the wisdom and sincerity of our highest Church Court. The Philadelphia Presbytery gives Dr. Smith great credit for his speech, and says of the action of 1865, "Vexatious orders have been, and are not unlikely to continue so, unless in cases where they are quietly ignored."—Under such teaching as this there is little hope of harmony in the church, nay, there is imminent danger of damaging reaction, if not repeal.

Last year, the controversy with the opposers of the action of the Assembly had to be carried on with the same position on the part of the press of our church. Then the Editors wanted the action of 1865 brought into harmony with our standards; now, having failed at St. Louis, they insist that it shall be a dead letter. It is surely "vexatious," that after our church has taken its ground, and has adhered to it by a majority of "four to one," only two papers out of seven, conducted by men in our church, stand up squarely for our deliverances.

THEORY VS. PRACTICE. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge thus defines the Church Visible: "The Church Visible of Christ is the kingdom of God in this world, created through the communion of saints, developed externally through principles inherent in human nature and common to other societies, possessed of a peculiar and divinely appointed organization, separate from the world, and so a divine institute among men; that all the members of it are members of Jesus Christ, its Lord and Head, whose Body it is—the infallible rule of whose faith and practice is the revealed will of God—to expand and apply, to administer and enforce which, are its sole functions as a government separate from the world—the scope of all its powers, being the scope of its own end, exclusively spiritual, and exclusively directed to the gathering and perfecting of the

saints, who are lost sinners saved by grace."

(Knowl. of God, Subj. Chm. page 413.) Can anybody reconcile the principles of this definition with the Deliverance of 1862, or with the present attitude of the venerable author? We think it is an impossible problem.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.
The Catholic Church and the War.

Smyrna, Ind., Oct. 28, 1866. Mr. Editor: Do you not do the Catholic Church and Catholics a wrong in saying: "they did not hesitate to adopt such measures, in any case, as would secure the interests of the Church in that particular locality?" I think you do, as it is a virtual charge that they held to different policies in different places, to receive the benefits that might accrue in catering to public opinion. I think if your mind had not been engrossed by the difficulties in your own church, that you would find in no instance that the Catholic Church have any thing to do with politics, except to pray that the bloody war might cease.

It is true some individuals of the Catholic clergy and hierarchy were in favor of a war rather than the Union divided; but the greater part of them, as well as nine-tenths of the laity, were opposed to the war, but neither ever insisted that the church or clergymen should take sides in political affairs, or condemn either the North or the South. A few priests made themselves ridiculous, (one of them shining a flag-staff to set the flag right.) The flag was hung by some silly person over the Cathedral in Philadelphia, and Archbishop Hughes delivered a speech, instead of preaching a sermon, in the Cathedral at New York,—in which he urged a draft, because the rich manufacturers were closing their shops, and thus forcing poor men into the army, who did not wish to go, by refusing them employment elsewhere, and thus saving themselves from going to war. Though the Archbishop did hear both priests and laymen denounce it, and never one upheld it.

As for Gen. Rosecrans' "order," I believe that had he enforced it against his own church he would have been excommunicated; though that church could not have done so unless the order had been in the hands of the Catholic that can or will be held in eternal disgrace that he ever signed or sanctioned such a famous declaration as was contained in that "order." Had Gen. Rosecrans been a true man, he would have signed before he would ever have sanctioned such a tyrannical and outrageous military usurpation, which was a direct blow at the Church of Christ and all religious liberty. I never could shake hands with him, or treat him as a gentleman, until he has atoned for that outrage on the consciences of many, and every Catholic that ever I talked with about it, feels the same way. But though individuals have erred, the church and great body of her members adhered to the cause of civil liberty, and the rights of the church and humanity, being guided by principle, and not influenced by worldly considerations, as you charge.

I would be glad, Mr. Editor, if you would insert this in your columns, for the purpose of showing your readers that there were no traitor friends of civil and religious liberty than the Catholics of this country; and I would also point out the Freeman's Journal, a Catholic paper, as the ablest, boldest and most consistent defender of religious liberty in the land, which at all times denounced any and every outrage committed on other denominations, the same as if they had been committed on his own church.

I wish you well in your publication, as you uphold, against a mighty power and influence, the true doctrine of a separation of Church and State, and have always endeavored to extend your circulation among Protestants, and will continue to do so. Yours truly, A. CATHOLIC.

The Call for Ministers Reported.—The Presbytery of Arkansas state in their late narrative, that a majority of the churches under their care are without ministers and the stated means of grace. So far as heard from, there seems to exist a very earnest desire among the members of most of the churches to secure these privileges and a disposition to make a great sacrifice to obtain them. The call for laborers in these destitute portions of our Zion is loud and imperative, and the prospect of an extensive and permanent usefulness which they hold out to earnest and devoted laborers in the Master's vineyard, are such as to justify the Presbytery in commending them to the attention, sympathy and prayers of the church at large.

To be always intending to live a new life, but never to find time to set about it, is as if a man should put off eating and drinking from one day to another, till he is starved and destroyed.

